

To whom this concerns,

I wish to contribute to the debate on the BBC's charter

In my view, and virtually all those with whom I have discussed this subject, the BBC should lose the right to be funded by the public and therefore the TV licence should be abolished

The corporation, in my view, has become arrogant and contemptuous. The BBC does not have to raise its own revenue and therefore the programs do not have to be good enough to satisfy sponsors and advertisers. It is given its vast revenue by the British public and by the sale of its products at home and overseas.

Any organisation that does not have to live in the "real world", and is given the vast amount of revenue that the BBC is given, is always liable to lose track of why it exists

BBC news had a world wide reputation for accuracy and stating the facts of a situation. During the last gulf war, it sent personnel

running around this country and abroad, seeking those who were anti-war and putting forward their views. The BBC had a clear policy of being anti-war and anti-government.

Phone-in programs, that had subjects chosen by the BBC, guests that were hand-picked by the BBC, and had contributors that are chosen by the BBC when incoming calls were filtered by the BBC, all gave a biased and one-sided opinion of the war. It invited disillusioned and biased old ministers of the government, knowing that they would be totally anti-government.

On "SKY NEWS", "CNN", and "ITV NEWS", we were shown 'both sides of the argument'. At some time we were shown "BRUNG HTU" soldiers that were totally pro-war and at other times we were shown anti-war soldiers.

These channels have to remain balanced in order to keep viewers and to justify the revenue that they need.

The BBC launched new Digital channels that, if you check, are just repeats of old programs, but the BBC feel that it justified to have the public fund this, although the

3) Best majority do not watch these useless channels and half the country cannot even receive their BBC Radio and Television run regular trailers to advertise their own products. This time could be used to raise revenue in a commercial situation.

During the mines strike, the BBC edited newsreel to show mines attacking peaceful police, when the opposite actually happened. It was Arthur Scargill that eventually proved this. How can we trust the BBC after this incident. It makes you ask "HOW MANY MORE TIMES DOES THIS HAPPEN?"

We have "EBSZNDERS" that at 7.30pm shows violence, murder, incest, gay love, people whose life revolves around alcohol and extra-marital affairs as a normal way of life.

I could list programs that are of a poor quality but I would need a lot more space.

The reporting of the "SOTTAN MURDERS" was provided in a sensational way as in the gutter press, and not in a factual manner.

(4) I cannot understand why public money is able to be used by a corporation that is anti-government.

If commercial channels chose to be anti-government, we can simply change channel and they lose viewers. With newspapers, we can chose to buy other newspapers, but with the BBC we are forced to fund their activities.

A total change is required. New management is required at all levels. The bitterness that the arrogant staff show toward an elected government is commonplace at the BBC.

I cannot see how they can criticise a government again without that being brassed. They will not settle until they have toppled an elected government, and if they succeed, they will use, or abuse, their power again and again.

The BBC needs to be moved to the private sector and should lose the right to extract revenue from people who do not wish to contribute. Their contempt for the Hutton enquiry was astounding.

Yours
DAVID COOPER